DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

744 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814



June 11, 1981

ALL-COUNTY INFORMATION NOTICE I-71-81

TO: ALL COUNTY WELFARE DIRECTORS

SUBJECT: AFDC DIVISION 15 QC/CA REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

REFERENCE:

This letter is to clarify the AFDC Quality Control/Corrective Action (QC/CA) reporting requirements under Division 15 regulations. It is our goal to achieve a greater consistency among the counties in the reporting of essential QC/CA information pursuant to Section 15-410.

Attached you will find this information presented in the format which you should now use. Included in the attachment are clarifications of Section 15-410. This is being provided for your use as a guideline when preparing the six-month report.

These guidelines should be incorporated in the October 1980 - March 1981 Corrective Action Report. However, if you have already completed this report, the format should be followed in the next six-month report.

With the rising error rates, it is becoming even more important for the corrective action report to be received from all counties on or before the due date. Your AFDC Management Consultant will also be relying to a greater degree on this information in ongoing efforts to provide effective corrective action assistance to the county.

If you have any questions, please contact your AFDC Management Consultant at (916) 445-4458.

Sincerely,

KYLE S. McKINSEY

Deputy Director

Atch.

cc: CWDA

SAMPLE FORMAT

		6 60	COUNTY	QUALITY CONTROL					
		-CORRECTI	FOR	SAMPLE PERIOD					
					DATE:				
I.	SUM	MARY ANALYS	IS (i.e. 15-410.1	1)					
	The "summary analysis" referred to in this section should include an analysis of the quality control findings, desk review findings and the special studies that are to be identified under Section 15-410.12. Although the phrase "if applicable" appears in this section with reference to providing this summary analysis, there should always be a summarization of this information.								
	Example:								
	Α.	SAMPLE							
		. Total	cases drawn for r	eview					
		. Total	cases reviewed						
		• Total	dollars in sample		\$				
	В.	OVERPAYMEN	TS						
		• Total	cases						
		• Total	dollars		\$				
		• Case E	rror Rate		%				
		• Dollar	Error Rate		<u> </u>				
		. Client	caused errors						
		Nt	mber of cases			(%)		
		Nı	umber of dollars		\$	(%)		
		• Agency	caused errors						
		Nu	mber of cases			(%)		
		Nu	mber of dollars		\$	(%)		

C.	INELIGIBILITY			
	• Total cases			
	• Total dollars	\$		
	• Case error rate		%	
	. Dollar error rate		%	
	. Client caused errors			
	Number of cases	***************************************	(%)
	Number of dollars	\$	(%)
	. Agency caused errors			
	Number of cases	<u> </u>	(%)
	Number of dollars	\$	(%)
D. E.	COMBINED INELIGIBILITY AND OVERPAYMENT ERROR Case error rate Dollar error rate UNDERPAYMENTS Total cases Total dollars Case error rate			
	Pollow roman make	% %		
	Client caused errors	,fo		
	Number of cases		(%)
	Number of dollars	\$	(%)
	• Agency caused errors			
	Number of cases	******	(%)
	Number of dollars	Ś	(%)

F. STATEMENT OF TYPE, CAUSE AND NUMBER OF ERRORS

The "statements of the causes of errors" (i.e. for each error) to be included in this summary analysis should be more than merely a broad statement such as "client caused" or "agency caused". The detailed causative factor(s) for each error (e.g. client failure to report information; worker's misunderstanding of the regulations and/or the facts), including citation of regulation(s) involved, should be included.

Examples:

- Work-related expenses. EW computed transportation costs incorrectly (two cases). EAS
- Earned income. Client failed to report full time employment (one case). EAS
- Earned income. Client failed to report total earnings (two cases). EAS
- WIN. EW failed to have mother register after the youngest child became six years old (two cases). EAS

II. SPECIAL STUDIES/REPORTS (i.e. 15-410.12)

Data to be included under this section are reports resulting from special efforts to identify errors and what caused them (e.g. error cause determination study, etc.). Exclude the detailed quality control findings and desk review findings.

Examples:

- County's error cause determination study dated (Copy enclosed.)
- 1981, report of findings from county's random sampling from caseloads in specialized earned income unit. (Copy enclosed.)

III. CORRECTIVE ACTION (i.e. 15-410.14, .15 and .16)

The information requested in the noted sections should be presented in the format described below. This should make it easier for counties to provide the types of information required in a consistent, organized manner. Enough information should be provided to convey what is being done in the area of corrective action. It is understood that there might not be as much detail available for some types of corrective actions as there will be for others. As such, it will not always be possible to provide an in-depth cost benefit analysis or evaluation of a corrective action; however, one should be provided to the extent feasible.

- A. New or Planned Corrective Actions Not Previously Reported
 - Description
 - . Cost-Benefit Analysis
 - · Proposed Method of Evaluation
 - Implementation Timetable

Corrective actions that are of a one-time nature, were not previously reported, but have already been implemented and evaluated, should be included in this section. It should be indicated that these corrective actions will not be mentioned in future reports.

With respect to cost-benefit analysis of a proposed corrective action (C/A), it is understood that preparing one may not always be reasonable nor even possible. There are several bases upon which to determine whether a proposed C/A would be beneficial if implemented. The reduction in the numbers of specific types of errors and the amount of related dollar savings versus the county's costs of developing and implementing the C/A is of course the most obvious basis. It is suggested that all reasonable bases be given consideration.

- B. Status of Each Corrective Action Previously Reported
 - Description (same as first reported)
 - Date of six-month report in which the corrective action was first identified
 - . Major implementation tasks which have been completed
 - . Date that implementation was (or will be) completed
 - Evaluation

When an identified corrective action has been implemented and the evaluation completed, it should be stated that it will not be mentioned in future reports.